

REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 18-35, and 41-45 are pending in the application. Claims 1-12, 18-35, and 41-45 stand rejected. Claims 1 and 24 are hereby amended. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims and consideration of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Based Upon 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Independent Claims 1 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,511,199 (Anthias, et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,442,999 (Travis), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,889,957 (Ratner). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 requires, in part, determining a transport protocol at run-time for a message object based on the destination information by selecting a one of a process to process transport protocol, a process to pathway protocol, or a process to socket protocol. Claim 1 advantageously provides a framework for developing and operating client applications to interface with loosely coupled parallel processing computing machines, such as the Tandem S70K computer running the Guardian operating system. Anthias, Travis, and Watsen, separately and in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended claim 1. In particular, none of the references teach determining a transport protocol at run-time by selecting a one of a process to process transport protocol, a process to pathway protocol, or a process to socket protocol.


In regards to Ratner, the Examiner argues that Ratner teaches determining a transport protocol at run-time. However it appears that Ratner teaches determining a process to process transport protocol at run-time. In contrast, claim 1 requires selecting from either a process to process, a process to pathway, or a process to socket transport protocol. Ratner does not teach or suggest this added limitation.

Independent claim 24 contains limitations similar to claim 1 and is therefore also allowable over the art of record. The remaining dependent claims contain limitations that render them separately allowable over the prior art. However, applicant forgoes such a discussion in the interest of brevity.

CONCLUSION

The claims in their present form are allowable over the art of record. Applicant therefore solicits their allowance. Any fees in addition to those submitted may be charged to deposit account 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,



SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Stephen S. Roche, Reg. No. 52,176

Setter Ollila LLC

Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 15

Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Harley R. Ball

6391 Sprint Parkway

Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100

Overland Park, KS 66251-2100